UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,208	03/26/2004	Yuen Fai Wong	019959-004200US	8639
	7590 08/27/200 AND TOWNSEND AN	EXAMINER		
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834			PATEL, CHANDRAHAS B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/27/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/810,208	WONG ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Chandrahas Patel	2616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 11 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of A eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar ., or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (t MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of nortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOT v);	E below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	·		•
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). 	owabie ii submilled in a separale, i	imely filed amendmer	it canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See continuation sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (label{eq:12. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Frank Duong/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2616	

Continuation of 11. NOTE: The request for reconsideration does not raise any new issues therfore the amendments will be entered. Applicant argues that Fig. 2, 140 of Maher does not teach aggregation module that receives data streams from plurality of ports and combines them. However, examiner disagrees. Col. 6, lines 5-14 teach Fig. 2, 102 can consists of plurality of ports. Therefore, if plurality of ports are sending data to 140 aggregation module combines these data stream and analyzes them in Payload Analyzer. Applicant further argues that the first processors and the aggregation module cannot be considered in isolation. However, the claim language does not offer any such functionality. Further, Scholten's ingress data processors are part of one circuit which is of Fig. 2, 204A. Applicant argues that each ingress data port does not receive the input data stream from the first processor. However, examiner disagrees. Scholten teaches Transmit FIFOs receive data from Ingress data processors which than send data to aggregation module. Applicant argues that Scholten does not teach second bandwidth is smaller than the first bandwidth. However, examiner disagrees. Scholten teaches sum of the aggregated bandwidths of data provided by the plurality of ingress ports is less than the data rate of the network 104. Fig. 3, 314 corresponds to ingress data processors which form the first data link and Fig. 3, 316 corresponds to egress data processors which form the second data link. Applicant argues that Scholten does not teach a second data link having a bandwidth greater than the first bandwidth. However, examiner disagrees. Scholten teaches aggregated data rate of the path is allowed to exceed the maximum data rate bandwidth. Applicant argues that Maher does not teach generating a packet descriptor which contains a reference to a memory location of its analyzed data packet stores in the memory. However, examiner disagrees. Context is used to load packets in and out of buffer as taught by Maher in Col. 9, lines 63-66 therefore context is used as a reference to memory location of data packets in memory. Applicant argues that Maher does not teach arbitrating and selecting a packet descriptor from among the priority gueues. However, examiner disagrees. Maher teaches using context which are packet descriptors to retriever required block of information from the memory. Applicant argues that Scholten does not teach analyzing input data streams and each processor has an input analyzer. However, examiner disagrees. Scholten teaches the device diverts the packets based on a destination identifier. This is analyzing data packets based on destination identifier.